

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended, and non-elected claims 26-37 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-25 are now pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 14-25 are allowable. As discussed below, Applicants believe that claims 1-13 are now also allowable.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,538,461 to Novak et al. ("Novak"), and claims 4, 6, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious in view of Novak and U.S. Patent No. 6,050,829 to Eldridge ("Eldridge"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 describes the terminals on the first surface of the substrate as "electrically insulated one from another," and claim 1 similarly describes the signal pads on the second surface of the substrate as "electrically insulated one from another." Claim 1 also includes "a plurality of electrically conductive paths" each of which connects "one of said terminals with one of said signal pads" and each of which is "electrically insulated" from the other electrically conductive paths. Claim 1 thus includes electrically isolated conductive paths from each terminal on the first surface of the substrate to each signal pad on the second surface of the substrate.

In contrast, Novak's signal pads 112-S1 and 112-S2 (which were equated with the terminals of claim 1) are all connected to ground plane 103. Moreover, if Novak's signal pads 112-S1 and 112-S2 are electrically connected to surface pad 112-G (which was equated with the signal pads of claim 1), the signal pads 112-S1 and 112-S2 are connected to the surface pad 112-G through ground plane 103. Novak therefore does not teach or suggest electrically isolated paths from terminals on one side of Novak's substrate to signal pads on the other side of the substrate, as required by claim 1 of the instant application. Independent claim 1 thus patentably distinguishes over Novak.

Eldridge was relied on only for its teachings regarding distances between terminals. Therefore, independent claim 1 also patentably distinguishes over any combination of Novak and Eldridge.


Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and therefore also patentably distinguish over Novak and Eldridge.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all of the claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicants' attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (801) 323-5934.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 28, 2004

By


N. Kenneth Burraston
Reg. No. 39,923

Kirton & McConkie
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
P.O. Box 45120
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-1004
Telephone: (801) 323-5934
Fax: (801) 321-4893